			UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,742	02/06/2002	Mark R. Hansen	077077-9141-00	2995
23409 7:	590 11/09/2005		EXAM	INER
	EST & FRIEDRICH, LL	SAFAIPOUR, HOUSHANG		
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE MILWAUKEE, WI 53202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			DATE MAILED: 11/09/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

.

.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/072,742	HANSEN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Houshang Safaipour	2627					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 							
Status							
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 September 2005</u>. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 							
Disposition of Claims							
 4) ∑ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-14 and 18-20</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ∑ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-14 and 18-20</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	г.	1					
	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1)							
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	6) 🗌 Other:						

PTOL-326	7-05)

.

-

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 8, 2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendment filed on September 8, 2005 has been entered and made of record.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of

rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sikes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,201) and further in view of Guha et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,750,466).

Regarding claim 1, Sikes et al. discloses a camera assembly of a printing press

comprising:

a housing (46) that is movable by a transport system (motor 52); an image sensor (30) positioned within said housing and adapted to acquire images of a moving substrate of a printing press; a light source (40) positioned within said housing; an optics assembly (32) positioned within said housing (fig. 1, col. 6, lines 20-65). Although Sikes et al. discloses CPU and microprocessor for processing the images (col. 7, lines 63-67), Sikes does not disclose that the processing hardware is within the carriage. Guha in his Web Inspection system discloses a smart camera which in addition to scanning components includes pre-processor and image analyzer within a smart camera box. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to combine Guha's smart camera with Sikes apparatus in order to have all components within the carriage as disclosed by Sikes. This combination would reduce the size of the apparatus and also reduces the volume of data because the web image data is processed inside the camera enclosure (Guha, col. 6, lines 64-66).

Regarding claim 2, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image sensor is a CCD scanner (fig. 1, sensor 30).

Regarding claim 4, Sikes discloses a strobe light (fig. 1)

Regarding claim 5, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said optics assembly include a lens (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 9, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 and further including a communication interface (col. 7, lines 23-25).

Regarding claims 11 and 18, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable to claims 11 and 18.

Regarding claim 19, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 18 wherein said housing has a width dimension of no more than four inches (fig. 1).

Claims 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sikes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,201).

Regarding claim 3, Sikes et al. does not explicitly discloses a camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image sensor is an area scanner. The use of area scanner is well known and routinely implemented in scanning art as admitted by the applicant (Page 6, line 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the use of area scanner in Sikes' system.

Regarding claim 7, Sikes et al. does not explicitly disclose the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image processing hardware includes at least one FPGA. The use of FPGA is well known and routinely implemented in scanning art (Official Notice). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the use of FPGA in Sikes' system

Regarding claim 8, although Sikes' et al. does not explicitly disclose the camera assembly of claim 1 and further including a power supply, power supply is the essential part of the assembly to provide power to the different instruments.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 2 and 7 are applicable to claims 12 and 13.

Regarding claim 14, please refer to discussion under claim 1 and also col. 29 line 57 through col. 30 line 13.

Regarding claim 20, Sikes' et al. does not explicitly disclose a camera assembly to include at least one rib. Enclosures with ribs are well known and routinely implemented in scanning art (Official Notice). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include ribs in the enclosure assembly of Sikes' apparatus to improve heat dissipation.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Houshang Safaipour whose telephone number is (571)272-7412. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles, Sr. can be reached on (571)272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Houshang Safaipour Patent Examiner Art Unit 2627 November 4, 2005